REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed November 18, 2003 is respectfully requested.

All claims, as originally filed, have been rejected. Claims 12, 13, and two occurrences of claim 27 have been cancelled. Claims 34-37 have been added. Claims 1, 11, 15, 18, 20, 21, 23-26, 28, 29, and 31 have been amended. As such, claims 1-11, 14-26, and 28-37 are currently pending.

Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled. When studying the claims, the Applicant noted that as originally filed, two claims were inadvertently numbered as "claim 27." In an effort to correct this mistake, both occurrences of claim 27 have been canceled, and the subject matter of these claims has been reintroduced as claims 34 and 35. Claim 34 differs from the first of the original claims 27 in that it has been amended for clarity and to recite that an IP message is relayed through a radio access network. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification, as for example on page 14 at lines 12-14.

The Applicant realizes that by canceling both occurrences of claim 27, the Applicant's numbering scheme for the claims appears to differ from that used by the Examiner, as the Examiner appears to have renumbered the second occurrence of claim 27 as claim 28, and carried the renumbering through to the last originally filed claim. However, since the Applicant is unaware of any method which may be used to renumber claims in an amendment, the Applicant has cancelled both claims 27 and reintroduced the subject matter of the claims as new claims 34 and 35.

Claim 1 has been amended for clarity, and to recite that an IP message is relayed through a radio access network. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification, as for example on page 14 at lines 12-14. Claims 25 and 26 have been amended in a similar manner Claim 15 has been amended to recite that an IP message is sent to a service provider control

point through a radio access network. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification, as for example on page 14 at lines 12-14. Claims 28, and 29 have been amended in a similar manner.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite that determining whether a cellular phone device is in an area of restricted access includes determining whether an IP message that includes information that the cellular phone device has entered an area of restricted access has been relayed through a radio access network. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification, *e.g.*, on page 14 at lines 4-17. Claim 11 has further been amended to recite that processing a call if a cellular phone device is not in an area of restricted service access includes forwarding the call to the cellular phone device. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification, as for example on page 16 at lines 10-17.

Claim 18 has been amended for consistency. Claim 20 has been amended to correct an error in dependency, and for clarity. Specifically, claim 20 has been amended to depend directly from claim 18 and indirectly from claim 15, proper antecedent basis with respect to claim 18. Claim 20 has also been amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

Claims 21 and 31 have been amended to recite configurable hushing messages and hush commands, respectively. Support for these amendments may be found in the Specification, on page 14 at lines 15-17. Claims 23 and 24 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis and to correct errors in dependency.

New claim 36 requires that a cellular phone device includes a transmitter, and that a configurable hushing message is configurable to cause the cellular phone device turn off only the transmitter. Support for this new claim may be found in the Specification, as for example on page 15 at lines 12-15. New claim 37 recites that entering a hush mode includes one of causing the cellular phone to vibrate and turning off a transmitter of the cellular phone. Support for this new claim may be found, for instance, in the Specification from page 14 at line 20 to page 15 at line 15.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-18, 21, and 23-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariga (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,455) in view of Chang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,406). Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariga in view of Chang et al. and further in view of Bansal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,272). Claims 7, 19, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariga in view of Chang et al. and further in view of Hsu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,684). Claims 13 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariga in view of Chang et al. and further in view of Haartsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,351,643).

1. Independent claims 1, 25, 26, 34, and their respective dependents

Claim 1, as amended, requires that a method of spatially controlling cellular phone access includes receiving an IP message at a central facility that is relayed through a radio access network, and updating data associated with a cellular phone device in response to receiving the IP message at the central facility. Hence, claim 1 requires that an IP message is relayed through a radio access network in an IP-based cellular wireless communication system.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Ariga nor Chang et al., alone or in combination, teaches of or reasonably suggests receiving an IP message that is relayed through a radio access network. In the Office Action dated November 18, 2003, the Examiner has acknowledged that Ariga does not teach of an IP-based cellular wireless communication system or an IP message, and Chang et al. appears to specifically teach that IP messages are transported using UDP/IP (Chang et al., column 8, lines 1-5). Transporting IP messages using UDP/IP does not suggest relaying an IP message through a radio access network.

Claim 1 requires updating data associated with a cellular phone device in response to receiving an IP message at a central facility. Chang et al. teach that a base switching center and a

gateway router do not interpret IP messages (Chang et al., column 8, lines 5-6). The Applicant submits that in addition to the IP message not being received at a central facility (switching center) through a radio access network, since a base switching center of Chang et al. does not interpret IP messages, Chang et al. does not teach of performing any updating in response to a received IP message. As such, a combination of Ariga and Chang et al. does not reasonably suggest updating data associated with a cellular phone device in response to receiving the IP message or of receiving an IP message relayed through a radio access network. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is believed to be allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-10 each depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and are therefore each believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Each of these dependent claims recites additional limitations which, when considered in light of claim 1, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record.

Claims 25, 26, and 34 recite similar limitations are recited in independent claim 1. As such, claims 25, 26, and 34, as well as claim 35 which depends directly from claim 34, are each believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

2. Independent claims 15, 28, 29, and their respective dependents

Independent claim 15, as amended, requires that a method of operating a quiet zone controller includes detecting a cellular phone device entering an area, and sending an IP message to a service provider control point through a radio access network. It is respectfully submitted that no combination of the art of record teaches of sending an IP message to a service provider control point though a radio access network. Chang et al. specifically teach that IP messages are transported using UDP/IP (Chang et al., column 8, lines 1-5) between a mobile station and a base switching center (Chang et al., column 8, lines 1-5). As such, amended claim 15 and its dependents are each believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least this reason.

Claims 28 and 29 recite similar limitations are recited in independent claim 15. Hence, claims 28 and 29, in addition to claim 30 which depends directly from claim 29, are each believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 15.

3. Independent claim 11 and its dependents

Amended independent claim 11 recites that a method of spatially controlling cellular phone access includes receiving a call at a central facility, and determining whether the cellular phone device is in an area of restricted service access. Determining whether the cellular phone device is in the area of restricted service access includes determining whether an IP message that includes information that the cellular phone device has entered the area of restricted service access has been relayed through a radio access network.

No combination of the art of record teaches of or reasonably suggests receiving an IP message relayed through a radio access network that includes information that a cellular phone device has entered an area of restricted service address. Chang et al. teach of a radio link protocol, but specifically teach that IP messages are transported using UDP/IP (Chang et al., column 8, lines 4-5). It is respectfully submitted that transporting IP messages using UDP/IP does not reasonably suggest relaying an IP message that includes information that a cellular phone device has entered an area of restricted service access through a radio access network. Hence, the Applicant submits that the art of record does not teach of or suggest that determining whether a cellular phone device is in an area of restricted service access includes determining whether an IP message has been relayed through a radio access network. Therefore, claim 11 and its dependents are each believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least this reason.

4. Independent claims 21, 31, and their respective dependents

Amended claim 21 recites that a cellular phone device is capable of varying its behavior in response to a configurable hushing message that comprises IP packets. A configurable hushing message allows a cellular phone device to respond in different ways, as appropriate, instead of just turning off the cellular phone device. For example, when it is important to prevent RF interference to sensitive devices, a configurable hushing command may turn off the cellular phone device (Specification, page 15, lines 12-15). Alternatively, when it is important for audible disturbances to be prevented, but not important to prevent RF interference, a configurable hushing command may be used to have the phone vibrate rather than ring (Specification, from page 14 at line 20 to page 15 at line 12).

It is respectfully submitted that the power OFF request signal taught by Ariga is not configurable, and merely causes a device to be powered off when the device comes close to a building in which a base station device has been installed (Ariga, column 5, lines 1-17). A power OFF request which powers off a device is not that same as and does not reasonably suggest a configurable hushing command, as a power OFF request is not configurable. Since no combination of the art of record appears to teach of a configurable hushing command, claim 21 is believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 22-24 and 36 each depend directly from independent claim 21, and are each therefore believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 21. Each of these dependent claims recites additional limitations which, when considered in light of claim 21, are each believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record. By way of example, new claim 36 requires that a cellular phone device includes a transmitter, and that the configurable hushing messages causes the cellular phone device either to turn off only the transmitter. Turning off only the transmitter allows the cellular phone device to function at some level while preventing RF interference to sensitive devices. While Ariga teaches of completely powering off a device in response to a power OFF command (Ariga, column 5, lines 1-10), neither Ariga nor Chang et al., either alone or in

combination, teaches of or reasonably suggests turning off only a transmitter. As such, claim 36 is believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least this additional reason.

As amended, independent claim 31 recites limitations similar to those recited in claim 21. As such, claim 31 and its dependents are each believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 21.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 446-8696.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy A. Su
Reg. No. 41,336

RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN LLP
12930 Saratoga Ave., Suite D1
Saratoga, CA 95070
Tel: 408-446-8690
Fax: 408-446-8691